

OU-TP-98-61P
hep-th/9808068
July 1998

VACUUM INSTABILITY IN TOPOLOGICALLY MASSIVE GAUGE THEORY

Alex Lewis*

*Department of Physics, Theoretical Physics
University of Oxford, 1 Keble Road, Oxford, OX1 3NP
United Kingdom*

ABSTRACT

We find the critical charge for a topologically massive gauge theory for any gauge group, generalising our earlier result for $SU(2)$. The relation between critical charges in TMGT, singular vectors in the WZNW model and logarithmic CFT is investigated.

*e-mail: a.lewis1@physics.oxford.ac.uk

1 Introduction

It is well known that a topological Chern-Simons theory on a 3-dimensional manifold with a boundary induces a WZNW model on the boundary [1] which is a basic “building block” for all known unitary rational conformal field theories (CFT). Combining several Chern-Simons fields and/or factorising over some discrete symmetries one can give a three-dimensional construction for all known unitary rational CFT [2], for example, minimal models [3] through a GKO coset construction [4]. In unitary WZNW and minimal models, primary fields only exist for a restricted number of representations. For example for the $SU(2)$ model, only the representations with $j = 0, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{k}{2}$ are allowed, while in the minimal model the allowed primary fields are those which satisfy the above condition for each of the three $SU(2)$ factors in the GKO construction. In [5] we showed that the truncation of the spectrum in the $SU(2)$ case was associated with a critical charge in the corresponding topologically massive gauge theory (TMGT). This let us see that critical and super-critical charges would cause vacuum instability and be excluded from the spectrum of the three-dimensional theory as well. We also found that, surprisingly, the quantization of a theory with a critical charge, which was worked out in [6], leads to a Jordan block structure for the Hamiltonian which is similar to what is now known from logarithmic conformal field theory. The purpose of this paper is to present these results in detail and extend them to any compact group.

The topological Chern-Simons theory is the low-energy limit of a topologically massive gauge theory [7]-[9] with the action:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{TMGT} &= -\frac{1}{2e^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \operatorname{tr} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + k S_{CS} \\ S_{CS} &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{4\pi} \operatorname{tr} \left(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A \right) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \frac{1}{4\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \operatorname{tr} \left(A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\lambda + \frac{2}{3} A_\mu A_\nu A_\lambda \right) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Where $A_\mu = A_\mu^a t^a$, and t^a are the generators of the gauge group G . This is the action for gauge bosons with topological mass $M = ke^2/4\pi$. If the three dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}$ has a boundary, the TMGT induces a deformed conformal field theory on the boundary. In the nonabelian case the CFT will be deformed with a deformation parameter proportional to $1/e^2$, and so the WZNW model can be induced from a TMGT with a boson mass of the order of the UV cut-off, so that the F^2 term regularizes the Chern-Simons action and we recover the WZNW model by letting the mass $M \rightarrow \infty$. If the TMGT is defined on a manifold with a boundary, it will induce a chiral WZNW model on the boundary. By taking a cylinder, with one chiral half of the WZNW model on each boundary, one can

obtain the full WZNW model, defined by

$$S_{WZNW}(k; g) = \frac{k}{8\pi} \int d^2z \operatorname{Tr} g^{-1} \partial^\mu g g^{-1} \partial_\mu g + \frac{ik}{12\pi} \int d^3z \operatorname{Tr} g^{-1} dg \wedge g^{-1} dg \wedge g^{-1} dg \quad (2)$$

A primary field of the WZNW model, $\Phi(z, \bar{z}) = V_L(z)V_R(\bar{z})$, can be induced on the boundary by a path-ordered Wilson line

$$W_R[C] = \operatorname{tr}_R \exp \left(i \int_C A \right) \quad (3)$$

where C is a contour with one end point on each boundary. The Wilson line coincides with The holomorphic part of the primary field V_L on one boundary and with the anti-holomorphic part V_R on the other, and it describes the transport of a particle in the representation R from one boundary to the other. It is therefore clear that the same representations of the gauge group have to occur in the bulk as on the boundary.

In the same way, a supersymmetric WZNW model can be induced on the boundary of a three dimensional manifold by a supersymmetric CS theory, which is the low energy limit of a supersymmetric TMGT, defined by the action [7, 10]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} = & S_{TMGT} + \frac{1}{2e^2} \int d^3x \bar{\chi}^a i \gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu \chi^a + i f^{abc} A_\mu^b \chi^c \right) - \frac{k}{8\pi} \int d^3x \bar{\chi}^a \chi^a \\ & + \frac{k}{8\pi} \int d^3x i \bar{\lambda}^a \left(\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \chi^a - \frac{1}{3} f^{abc} \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \lambda^b L^c - \frac{2}{3} f^{abc} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \gamma_\nu \partial_\mu \lambda^b A_\rho^c \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where χ^a are Majorana fermion fields in the adjoint representation of G , and L^a are auxiliary scalar fields with λ^a their Majorana spinor superpartner fields. In this case we have both vector bosons and Majorana fermions with the topological mass $M = ke^2/4\pi$ in the bulk, and on the boundary we get the super-WZNW model with the action [11]

$$S_{SWZNW} = S_{WZNW}(k; g) + \frac{ik}{8\pi} \int d^2z \operatorname{tr} \left[\bar{\psi}^\dagger \left[\not{\partial} + \gamma_5 \not{\partial} g g^\dagger \right] \psi \right] \quad (5)$$

The fermions in the SWZNW action can be decoupled completely by the transformation

$$\chi = \frac{1}{2} \left[(1 + \gamma_5) g^\dagger \psi + (1 - \gamma_5) \psi g^\dagger \right] \quad (6)$$

but this transformation is anomalous, and leads to the following action

$$S_{SWZNW} = S_{WZNW}(k; g - C_2) + \frac{ik}{8\pi} \int d^2z \operatorname{tr} [\bar{\chi} \not{\partial} \chi] \quad (7)$$

where C_2 is the Casimir of the adjoint representation of the group G

$$C_2 \delta^{ab} = f^{acd} f^{bcd} \quad (8)$$

The bosonic part of the super-WZNW model at level k is therefore the ordinary WZNW at level $k - C_2$, and the spectrum in the supersymmetric model is the same as for the WZNW at level $k - C_2$ and the free fermions. For example, the conformal dimension of a primary field in a representation $\mathcal{R}$ of G , with Casimir C_R , is $\Delta = C_R/(k + C_2)$ in the WZNW model and $\Delta = C_R/k$ in the SWZNW model. In the three-dimensional theories, $1/k$ is the expansion parameter for perturbation theory, so the ordinary TMGT and the bosonic part of the SUSY TMGT are the same at tree level, with the shift $k \rightarrow k - C_2$ appearing as a result of higher-order corrections [12]. In this paper we will only be working at the leading order in $1/k$ and so we will not be able to see the difference between the ordinary and supersymmetric TMGTs.

2 Truncation of the spectrum in WZNW model and in TMGT

We will begin by reviewing how the truncation of the spectrum of unitary representations occurs in the WZNW model, and then see how the same spectrum can arise by a completely different mechanism in TMGT. The WZNW has a $G_L \times G_R$ symmetry, generated by the currents

$$\begin{aligned} J(z) = J^a(z)t^a &= -\frac{k}{2}\partial g g^{-1} \\ \bar{J}(\bar{z}) = \bar{J}^a(\bar{z}) &= -\frac{k}{2}g^{-1}\bar{\partial} g \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The modes J_n^a generate the affine algebra with the commutation relations

$$[J_n^a, J_m^b] = \frac{nk}{2}\delta^{ab}\delta_{n+m,0} + f^{abc}J_{n+m}^c \tag{10}$$

We use the following basis for the generators of G . We have the generators of the Cartan subalgebra h^i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, r is the rank of G , and for each root α we have a step operator e^α , with the commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [h^i, h^j] &= 0 \\ [h^i, e^\alpha] &= \alpha^i e^\alpha \\ [e^\alpha, e^\beta] &= \epsilon(\alpha, \beta)e^{\alpha+\beta} \text{ if } \alpha + \beta \text{ is a root} \\ &= 2\alpha \cdot h/\alpha^2 \text{ if } \alpha = -\beta \\ &= 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\epsilon(\alpha, \beta)$ is antisymmetric in α and β , and $\alpha \cdot h = \sum_i \alpha^i h^i$. The current algebra of the WZNW model then has generators H_n^i , E_n^α , and the commutation relations (10) become

$$\begin{aligned}
[H_m^i, H_n^j] &= \frac{mk}{2} \delta^{ij} \delta_{n,-m} \\
[H_m^i, E_n^\alpha] &= \alpha^i E_{m+n}^\alpha \\
[E_m^\alpha, E_n^\beta] &= \epsilon(\alpha, \beta) E_{m+n}^{\alpha+\beta} \text{ if } \alpha + \beta \text{ is a root} \\
&= \{2\alpha \cdot H_{m+n} + km\delta_{m,-n}\} / \alpha^2 \text{ if } \alpha = -\beta \\
&= 0 \text{ otherwise}
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We consider a highest weight primary state $|\mu\rangle$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
H_n^i |\mu\rangle = E_n^\alpha |\mu\rangle &= 0, \quad \text{for } n \geq 1 \\
H_0^i |\mu\rangle &= \mu^i |\mu\rangle \\
E_0^\alpha |\mu\rangle &= 0, \quad \text{for } \alpha \text{ a positive root}
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Unitary representations only exist for weights μ which satisfy $\psi \cdot \mu \leq k/2$ with the highest root ψ normalized so that $\psi^2 = 1$. This can easily be seen by considering the norm of a descendant, using eqs. (12) and (13) and $E_n^{\alpha\dagger} = E_{-n}^{-\alpha}$:

$$|E_{-1}^\psi |\mu\rangle|^2 = \langle \mu | E_1^{-\psi} E_{-1}^\psi |\mu\rangle = \frac{1}{\psi^2} (k - 2\psi \cdot \mu) \langle \mu | \mu \rangle \tag{14}$$

This state therefore has negative norm when $\psi \cdot \mu > k/2$, and it is a null vector for a highest weight μ_0 such that $\psi \cdot \mu_0 = k/2$. This null vector has all the properties (eq. (13)) of a primary state with highest weight $\mu_0 + \psi$, and so we can write $||\mu_0 + \psi\rangle|^2 = 0$. There are also singular vectors at higher levels for the other unitary representations. In a unitary model, any correlation function containing a singular vector must be zero, and this leads to all non-unitary representations decoupling from the spectrum [13].

It is clear that, if the CFT is to be described by a three-dimensional Chern-Simons theory, this truncation of the spectrum also has to occur in the CS theory, and there must be states with zero norm in the CS theory as well. This must also be true at least in the low-energy limit in the TMGT theory, but in fact, we will see that it actually occurs in the full TMGT theory. To induce a primary field of the WZNW model on the boundary in a representation $\mathcal{R}$, we have to add to the CS model in the bulk a Wilson line carrying a source in the same representation, and so we expect that adding a source in a representation with $\mu \cdot \psi > k/2$ would for some reason make the three-dimensional theory non-unitary. In [5] we suggested that the physical reason for this is

that sources with higher charge are critical or super-critical - ie. that they cause vacuum instability because the bound states which they can form with charged particles have zero or imaginary energy. This is just the sort of behaviour that is familiar in the solution of the Dirac equation for an electron in the field of a point charge Ze in which case the energy of the ground state is $E(Z) = m_e \sqrt{(1 - \alpha^2 Z^2)}$, and so there is a critical charge $Z_c = 1/\alpha \approx 137$, with $E(Z_c) = 0$ and imaginary energy for $Z > Z_c$. In a nonabelian TMGT, the charged particles which can have bound states are just the massive gauge bosons themselves. We can therefore see that the dynamics of the TMGT are crucial for understanding even the low energy properties of the theory – even when the gauge bosons are infinitely massive, any states with exactly zero energy obviously cannot be ignored, and super-critical charges will never be formed because they would always be screened by pairs of charged particles which could condense from the vacuum with no energy cost. We will also see in the next section that the presence of a critical charge leads to a state with zero norm, just as in the WZNW model.

In this section we present the computation of the critical charge in a TMGT [5], showing how the result is generalized to arbitrary groups. We divide the gauge bosons into uncharged “photons” and charged bosons, by

$$A_\mu = \sum_i A_\mu^i h^i + \sum_\alpha A_\mu^\alpha e^\alpha \quad (15)$$

where the fields A_i^μ describe the photons and A_α^μ the charged particles. The charged bosons can be divided into positively and negatively charged for positive and negative roots – for a positive root α , $\alpha^i \geq 0$ for all i . Since $-\alpha$ is always a root if α is a root, the charged bosons therefore come in particle-antiparticle pairs with positive and negative charges. A classical external source in a highest weight state will then act as a source of photons, creating a potential for the charged particles. We will therefore treat the photons classically and try to solve the equations of motion for charged particles in the classical background created by the source. The equations of motion for the photons in the presence of a static source with weight μ are

$$\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} F_{\nu\lambda}^i + \frac{1}{M} \partial_\nu F^{\nu\mu} + \frac{2\pi\mu^i}{k} \eta^{0\mu} \delta^2(x) = 0 \quad (16)$$

This leads to the following solution for the electric and magnetic fields, $E_j^i = F_{j0}^i$ and $B^i = F_{12}^i$:

$$B^i(r) = -\frac{\mu^i M^2}{k} K_0(Mr), \quad E_\theta^i(0) = 0, \quad E_r^i(r) = -\frac{\mu^i M^2}{k} K_1(Mr) \quad (17)$$

where K_0 and K_1 are modified Bessel functions. By integrating eq. (16) we also find that at large distances ($r \gg 1/M$)

$$\int B^i d^2x = -\frac{2\pi\mu^i}{k} \quad (18)$$

so that, by Stokes' theorem, $A_\theta^i \sim -\mu^i/k r$. The fields A_μ^i can then conveniently be written in the gauge $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$ as

$$A_0^i = -\frac{B^i}{M}, \quad A_r^i = 0, \quad A_\theta^i = \frac{E_r^i}{M} - \frac{\mu^i}{k r} \quad (19)$$

We could now go on to write down the linearized equations of motion for the charged bosons in this background field, and try to solve them to find the energy of the ground state and hence the critical charge. In fact it is much simpler to analyse the equations for fermions in the same background. For this reason, it is useful to consider the supersymmetric TMGT, The background gauge field in the presence of a classical source is the same in the SUSY case as in the ordinary TMGT, and the spectrum of the bosons and fermions in the SUSY theory is of course the same, so to find the critical charge we can concentrate on the equation of motion for the fermions, which is just the Dirac equation $(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - M)\chi = 0$. As with the bosons, we can divide the fermions into charged and neutral particles by

$$\chi = \sum_i \chi^i h^i + \sum_\alpha \chi^\alpha e^\alpha \quad (20)$$

where the charge is positive if $\alpha^i \geq 0$, so that $\alpha \cdot \psi > 0$. We use a Majorana representation for the gamma matrices in $2+1$ dimensions $\gamma_0 = \sigma_2, \gamma_1 = i\sigma_1, \gamma_2 = i\sigma_3$, where σ_i are the Pauli matrices. The Dirac equation for a charged fermion is then

$$\begin{pmatrix} -D_2 - M & -D_0 - D_1 \\ D_0 - D_1 & D_2 - M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1^\alpha \\ \chi_2^\alpha \end{pmatrix} = 0 \quad (21)$$

where from the commutation relations (11) we can see that $D_\mu \chi^\alpha = (\partial_\mu + i\alpha^i A_\mu^i)\chi^\alpha$. We would expect a bound state for negatively charged fermions for a source with $\mu \cdot \psi > 0$, but in some circumstances in a TMGT there can be bound states between like charges and repulsion between unlike charges [14]. This is because a charge is a source of both electric and magnetic flux and the magnetic force is in the opposite direction to the usual electric force. We need to check that this is not the case in the present situation, as if there is no attraction between opposite charges there can obviously be no screening of

critical charges. An easy way to check this is to take the non-relativistic limit of eq. (21). We define $\chi_{\pm}^{\alpha} = \chi_1^{\alpha} \pm \chi_2^{\alpha}$, and in the non-relativistic limit the total energy $E = M + \epsilon$ with $|\epsilon| \ll M$ and also $|A_0^i| \ll M$. In this limit the Dirac equation becomes the Pauli equation, which in this case is

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_{\pm} &= \chi_{\pm} e^{i(M+\epsilon)x_0} \\ (\epsilon + \alpha^i A_0^i) \chi_{+} &= \frac{-i}{2M} \left((D_i)^2 - i\alpha^i B^i \right) \chi_{+}\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

The first term on the right of eq. (22) is the usual kinetic energy term, except that the centrifugal energy is modified by the Aharonov-Bohm effect, and the second term is the magnetic interaction. From eq. (19) we can see that the strength of the magnetic energy is just half that of the electric interaction, and so we still have attraction between opposite charges.

Since we are really interested in the critical charge for which $\epsilon = -M$, we cannot use the non-relativistic approximation any further and so we return to eq. (21). the attraction will be strongest for the negatively charged fermion $\chi^{-\psi}$, and so we need only consider that. If we define $q = \psi \cdot \mu/k$ and make the gauge transformation

$$\chi \rightarrow \chi' = \chi \exp \left[-\frac{A_0(r)}{M} - q \log(r) \right] \quad (23)$$

and define, for a solution with angular momentum m and energy E

$$\begin{aligned}x_{\pm} &= x_1 \pm ix_2 \\ f(r) &= -ix_+^{-m} \chi_+^{-\psi} e^{iEx_0} \\ g(r) &= rx_+^{-(m+1)} \chi_-^{-\psi} e^{iEx_0}\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

we obtain the following equations (with $x = Mr$, $\omega = E/M$)

$$\begin{aligned}(1 - \omega - qK_0(x))g(x) + f'(x) &= 0 \\ (1 + \omega + qK_0(x))f(x) + ((2q + 2m + 1)x^{-1} - 2qK_1(x))g(x) + g'(x) &= 0\end{aligned}\quad (25)$$

These are exactly the equations which we solved numerically in [5], and we can now see that with the above definition of q they apply for any simple group. We found the expected behaviour, with a critical charge very close to $q = 0.5$ (actually 0.498), because of which we conjecture that the exact solution will have the critical charge at exactly $q = 0.5$. This appears to indicate that we do indeed have the same truncation of the spectrum in TMGT

as in the WZNW model, with only representations with $\psi \cdot \mu \leq k/2$ allowed. However, this calculation is really only accurate to the lowest order in $1/k$, so we should say the critical charge is at

$$\psi \cdot \mu = \frac{k}{2} \{1 + O(k^{-1})\} \quad (26)$$

Of course, in the supersymmetric models we have to shift $k \rightarrow k - C_2$ compared to the bosonic models [11, 15, 12], but clearly this cannot be seen at this order. Also, we would not expect a critical charge at $\psi \cdot \mu = k/2$ as this representation is included in the physical spectrum of the WZNW model, and we would expect a critical charge to be screened a particle-antiparticle pair which could condense from the vacuum. We might expect that the true critical charge is $\psi \cdot \mu = (k + 1)/2$ which would exclude all the non-unitary representations since $\psi \cdot \mu$ is always an integer or half-integer, or that it is $\psi \cdot \mu = (k + 2)/2$, which is the null state in the WZNW model (with k replaced by $k - C_2$ in the supersymmetric case). To decide between these possibilities, we need to know how to quantize a theory with a critical charge – it turns out that the existence of a critical charge leads to a state having zero norm, so that the latter is probably correct, but it is not yet clear why states with $\psi \cdot \mu = (k + 1)/2$ should also be screened.

3 Critical States

The quantization of fields with zero energy bound states has been worked out in [6]. Although we have found a bound state for fermions, in the supersymmetric theory the spectrum for the gauge bosons must be the same, and so there will be a critical bound state of bosons at the same critical charge, and we can also expect the same features in the non-supersymmetric case, with the shift of $k \rightarrow k + C_2$. Since the bosons exist in all models we expect that the features in which we are interested will all appear in the quantization of a theory with a critical state for charged bosons, and we concentrate on that case. The treatment in [6] was for scalar bosons, but as vector bosons in $2 + 1$ dimensions only have one degree of freedom we can follow it exactly. We have the canonical commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [A(\mathbf{x}), \Pi(\mathbf{y})] &= i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \\ [A(\mathbf{x}), A(\mathbf{y})] &= 0, \quad \text{etc.} \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

We expand the field A and the conjugate momentum Π in terms of wave functions $\Phi^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ for continuum states with $\omega^2 = \mathbf{k}^2 + 1$ and $\Phi^i(\mathbf{x})$ for bound states with $\omega_i^2 < 1$, normalized

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\int \bar{\Phi}^i(\mathbf{x})\Phi^i(\mathbf{x})d^2x &= 1 \\ \int \bar{\Phi}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})\Phi^{\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x})d^3x &= \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}')\end{aligned}\quad (28)$$

The field operators at $t = 0$ can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned}A(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_i q_i \Phi^i(\mathbf{x}) + \int q(\mathbf{k})\Phi^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})d^3k \\ \Pi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_i p_i \bar{\Phi}^i(\mathbf{x}) + \int p(\mathbf{k})\bar{\Phi}^{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})d^3k\end{aligned}\quad (29)$$

The commutation relations (27) then become

$$[q_i, p_i] = i, \quad [q(\mathbf{k}), p(\mathbf{k}')] = i\delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'), \quad [q_i, q_j] = 0, \text{ etc.} \quad (30)$$

For bound states with $0 < \omega_i^2 < 1$, we introduce the mode operators a_i and b_i according to the standard rule

$$\begin{aligned}q_i &= \left(\frac{1}{2\omega_i}\right)^{1/2} (b_i^\dagger + a_i) \\ p_i &= -i\left(\frac{\omega_i}{2}\right)^{1/2} (b_i - a_i^\dagger)\end{aligned}\quad (31)$$

In terms of these operators, when there are no bound states with zero or imaginary energy the Hamiltonian is

$$H = \sum_i (p_i^\dagger p_i + \omega_i^2 q_i^\dagger q_i) + H_C = \sum_i (a_i^\dagger a_i + b_i^\dagger b_i) + H_C \quad (32)$$

where H_C is the part of the Hamiltonian that comes from the continuous states. The states $|a_i\rangle \equiv a_i^\dagger|0\rangle$ and $|b_i\rangle \equiv b_i^\dagger|0\rangle$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}H|a_i\rangle &= \omega_i|a_i\rangle, & \langle a_i|a_i\rangle &= 1 \\ H|b_i\rangle &= \omega_i|b_i\rangle, & \langle b_i|b_i\rangle &= 1\end{aligned}\quad (33)$$

So the Hamiltonian is of course diagonalizable and all states have positive norm.

Now we turn to the situation when there is a critical bound state, with $\omega_0 = 0$. The contribution of the critical state to the Hamiltonian is just

$$H_0 = p_0^\dagger p_0 \quad (34)$$

In the low energy limit we can take this to be the full Hamiltonian. Now we need to be careful about exactly how we quantize the theory. As we will see, there are actually two choices we can make, one of which leads to a unitary CFT on the boundary and the other to a logarithmic CFT. Instead of eq. (31), in this case we introduce the p_0 and q_0 as mode operators

$$c = p_0, \quad d = -iq_0^\dagger \quad (35)$$

with the commutation relations

$$[c, c^\dagger] = [d, d^\dagger] = 0, \quad [d^\dagger, c] = -1 \quad (36)$$

The Hamiltonian is $H = c^\dagger c$. Starting from a naive vacuum state $|0\rangle$, which of course is really a state containing a critical charge in the full TMGT, we can make two more zero energy states, $|c\rangle = c^\dagger|0\rangle$ and $|d\rangle = (c^\dagger + d^\dagger)|0\rangle$. If we assume that the “vacuum” $|0\rangle$ has a positive norm, $\langle 0|0\rangle = 1$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} H|c\rangle &= 0, & H|d\rangle &= |c\rangle \\ \langle c|c\rangle &= 0, & \langle c|d\rangle &= 1, & \langle d|d\rangle &= 2 \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

We can see from eq. (37) that even if we give the vacuum a positive norm, we are forced to have another eigenstate of the Hamiltonian $|c\rangle$, which has zero energy and zero norm. The other consistent way to quantize the theory is simply to take the vacuum to have zero norm: $\langle 0|0\rangle = 0$. Since the “vacuum” here is really a state with a critical charge, this would mean that the critical charge would decouple from physical spectrum. For this reason it is natural to view the critical charge in TMGT as being the equivalent of a singular vector in a CFT, which would mean that the critical charge was actually $\psi \cdot \mu = (k+2)/2$, or $\psi \cdot \mu = (k - C_2 + 2)/2$ in the supersymmetric case (in the case of $SU(2)$, $C_2 = 2$, so in the supersymmetric case our lowest order result would be exact, as we found in [5]). The charges with $\psi \cdot \mu = (k+1)/2$, which are not singular vectors but do have descendants with negative norm in the WZNW model, would seem to correspond more naturally to super-critical charges which have imaginary energy bound states but no state with exactly zero energy, but this clearly cannot be correct at least for single particle bound states. One possibility is that these charges are super-critical for multi-particle bound states, which may form because gauge bosons with the same charge can attract in TMGT [16]. Also, the charges with $\psi \cdot \mu > (k+2)/2$ are also singular vectors in the WZNW model, but at levels > 1 , and so these may correspond to critical bound states of more than one particle in the TMGT.

The first possibility considered above, leading to eq. (37), is what we have to consider if we insist on adding (super-) critical charged matter to the TMGT theory. the prototype for this situation is the supersymmetric model at level $k = C_2$, since all non-zero charges are excluded from the unitary theory and so this is the only non-trivial possibility. As was pointed out in [6], this does not necessarily lead to a catastrophic instability if we allow for a Hilbert space with a metric that is not positive definite. As we have seen in eq. (37), the Hamiltonian becomes non-diagonalizable, which is a familiar property of logarithmic CFT (LCFT) [17] where the 2d Hamiltonian is the Virasoro operator L_0 which acts on a logarithmic states as

$$L_0|C\rangle = \Delta|C\rangle, \quad L_0|D\rangle = \Delta|D\rangle + |C\rangle \quad (38)$$

and norms of the states are given by two-point correlation function, with one zero norm state [18]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle C(x)D(y) \rangle &= \langle C(y)D(x) \rangle = \frac{c}{(x-y)^{2\Delta_C}} \\ \langle D(x)D(y) \rangle &= \frac{1}{(x-y)^{2\Delta_C}} (-2c \ln(x-y) + d) \\ \langle C(x)C(y) \rangle &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The resemblance between these equations and eq. (37) is striking. Indeed, since the analysis leading to eq. (37) is not specific to the TMGT but applies to any theory with a critical state, and logarithmic operators appear in CFT when the dimensions of two operators become degenerate, we can regard the Jordan block structure of LCFTs as originating by the same mechanism, with L_0 as the Hamiltonian. It is also interesting that in a WZNW model (but not in all LCFTs) the field $C(x)$ which has zero norm always has to be a singular vector of another primary field [19], just as the 3 dimensional Hamiltonian can only be non-diagonalizable if there is a critical state. The null vectors in a WZNW model are the states $(E_{-1}^\psi)^{k+1-2\psi\cdot\mu}|\mu\rangle = |\mu + (k+1-2\psi\cdot\mu)\psi\rangle$, for each of which, if our interpretation of the critical state is correct, there should be a critical bound state of $k+1-2\psi\cdot\mu$ charged bosons and a source with $\psi\cdot\mu' = k+1-\psi\cdot\mu$. These two states and the logarithmic state $|D\rangle$ then satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} (E_{-1}^\psi)^{k+1-2\psi\cdot\mu}|\mu\rangle &\sim |C\rangle \\ (E_1^{-\psi})^{k+1-2\psi\cdot\mu}|D\rangle &\sim |\mu\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

So we can see that null states in the CFT on the boundary lead to critical bound states in the TMGT in the bulk, and if we want to include critical states which do not decouple

from the spectrum, we end up with a LCFT on the boundary and a similar type of theory in the bulk. Indeed it was first noticed in [20] that in the WZNW model for $SU(2)$ there are in general logarithmic singularities in the conformal blocks of primary fields with $j > k/2$. This is now known to indicate the existence of a LCFT, and contrary to what was said in [20] these conformal blocks can be combined to form local correlation functions. We therefore expect that for every unitary WZNW model, there is a logarithmic WZNW model with the same central charge. This would be parallel to the situation for the minimal models, where for every ordinary CFT in the $c_{p,q}$ series there is an enlarged model with the same central charge which is a LCFT [21].

4 Conclusions

These results are a confirmation that null vectors in CFT correspond to critical charges in three dimensions, as was found for one particular case in [5]. We have now shown that for every null vectors at level 1 in a WZNW model there is a critical bound state of a single charged gluon in a TMGT, and we expect that null vectors at higher levels will be associated with critical multi-gluon states. It is still unclear why in the three-dimensional picture sources with $\psi \cdot \mu = (k+1)/2$ (eg. a source in the representation $j = (k+1)/2$ for $SU(2)$), which in the WZNW model have descendants with negative norm but are not equivalent to singular vectors of unitary representations, should also be excluded from the spectrum. However, it is not surprising that a different mechanism should be needed to explain the decoupling of the states which are not singular vectors in the CFT. Another interesting question is the implications of these results for non-compact groups, since bound states of charged gluons can presumably occur in that case as well, which could lead to some states decoupling from the spectrum, as seems to be required for the no-ghost theorem for $SU(1,1)$ [22].

There are a number of interesting questions that remain. It will be interesting to check that higher-order corrections do result in the critical charges coinciding with null vectors in the CFT. Also, although it is very interesting that the Hamiltonians of both the TMGT and the CFT become non-diagonalizable when critical charges are added to the model, it is not yet clear exactly what the relation between the logarithmic operators in CFT and the critical states in TMGT is.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Ian Kogan for very helpful discussions.

References

- [1] E. Witten, Commun. Math. Phys. **121** (1989) 351.
- [2] G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **B220** (1989) 220.
- [3] A.A. Belavin, A.M. Polyakov and A. B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. **B241** (1984), 333.
- [4] P. Goddard, A. Kent and D. Olive, Commun. Math. Phys. **103** (1986) 105.
- [5] I. Kogan and A. Lewis, Phys. Lett. **B431** (1998), 77.
- [6] B. Schroer and J. Swieca, Phys. Rev. **D2** (1970), 2938.
- [7] W. Siegel, Nucl. Phys. **B156**, (1979), 135.
- [8] J.F. Schonfeld, Nucl. Phys. **B185**, (1981), 157.
- [9] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982), 975; Ann.Phys.(N.Y.) **140** (1982), 372.
- [10] N. Sakai and Y. Tanii, Prog. Theor. Phys. **83** (1990), 968.
- [11] P. Di Vecchia, G. Knizhnik, J. L. Petersen and P. Rossi, Nucl. Phys. **B253** (1985), 701.
- [12] G. Amelino-Camelia, I. I. Kogan, R. J. Szabo, Nucl. Phys. **B480** (1996), 413.
- [13] D. Gepner and E. Witten Nucl. Phys. **B278** (1986), 493.
- [14] I. Kogan, JETP Lett. **49** (1989), 225;
M. I. Dobroliubov, D. Eliezer, I. I. Kogan, G. W. Semenoff and R. J. Szabo, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A8** (1993), 2177.
- [15] J. Fuchs, Nucl.Phys. **B 286** (1987) 455.
- [16] I. I. Kogan and I. V. Polubin, JETP Lett. **51** (1990), 560; Phys. Lett. **B252** (1990), 237.

- [17] V. Gurarie, Nucl. Phys. **B410** (1993), 535.
- [18] J.S. Caux, I.I. Kogan and A. Tsvelik, Nucl. Phys. **B** 466 (1996), 444.
- [19] I. Kogan and A. Lewis, Nucl. Phys. **B509** (1998) 687.
- [20] P. Christe and R. Flume, Nucl. Phys. **B282** (1987) 466.
- [21] M. Flohr, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A12** (1997), 1943.
- [22] J. M. Evans, M. R. Gaberdiel and M. J. Perry, hep-th/9806024